

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **22 August 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. Claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Finn et al (USPN 5,826,032, hereinafter "Finn").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has amended dependent claims 9, 19, and 29 to correct the typographical error. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 1-2 of the instant application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by Finn. Applicant respectfully points out that Finn teaches **calculating a checksum** by at least one of the source computer or the sibling computer (see Finn, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention **bypasses computing a checksum** at either the source or the destination when using a reliable network link (see page 8, lines 14-25 and page 10, lines 3-9 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it eliminates the time and resources necessary to compute the checksum when using a reliable network link. There is nothing within Finn, either explicit or implicit, which suggests bypassing computing a checksum at either the source or the destination when using a reliable network link.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention bypasses computing a checksum at either the


source or the destination when using a reliable network link. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 14-25 and on page 10, lines 3-9 of the instant application. Dependent claims 3, 13, and 23 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 19 September 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665